

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 90, 98, 103 and 106 - 114 are pending in the present application with claims 90, 98, 103 and 114 being independent.

The Examiner has rejected claims 90, 98, 103 and 106 - 114 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,010,751 B2 (“Shneiderman ‘751”).

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Shneiderman ‘751 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,878 B1 (“Eintracht ‘878”).

Applicant has herein amended claims 90, 98, 103, 111, 113, and 114, and added new claims 115 to 117. For at least the reasons stated herein, Applicant asserts that the claims as presented are patentable over the cited prior art and are therefore in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner has rejected claims 90, 98, 103 and 106-114 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,010,751 B2 (“Shneiderman ‘751”).

Applicant has amended claims 90, 98, 103, and 114 to disclose “said at least one contact relationship.” The Examiner noted that, while the phrase “a multi-user computer network” appears in the preamble of claims 90, 98 and 114, the claims does not require the steps be performed on more than one computer. Applicant has amended claims 90, 98, 103, and 114 to reveal the use of more than one computer within the elements of the claims. Support for these amendments may be found in the disclosure in at least Figure 1.

As amended, Shneiderman ‘751 respectfully does not contemplate claim 90, element 3 “presenting a second client interface on said first computer configured for said at least one providing user of said plurality of providing users to create at least one contact relationship between said plurality of providing users.” Emphasis added. Instead, Shneiderman ‘751 describes a method where an electronic photographic image is displayed along with a list of

names of persons have been previously entered into the database. Col. 7, ll. 42 – 48. Shneiderman '751 does not disclose the creation of a contact relationship among the users. As such, Shneiderman '751 does not teach or suggest a method for creating “at least one contact relationship” between said plurality of providing users.”

Shneiderman '751 does not contemplate claim 90, element 4 as amended “obtaining said identifying information from said at least one providing user wherein said identifying information comprises information that uniquely identifies said at least one object in said image data and wherein said identifying information further comprises location information that identifies coordinates of said at least one object and wherein said identifying information further comprises data obtained from a list of said at least one contact relationship.” Emphasis added. Instead, Shneiderman '751 discloses a method where a name label is fixed in place, a tone is sounded, and the database entry of the X, Y coordinates is stored. Col. 8, ll. 8 – 12. Shneiderman does not disclose obtaining identifying information that comprises contact relationships. As such, Shneiderman '751 does not teach or suggest a method where the “identifying information further comprises data obtained from a list of said at least one contact relationship.”

Shneiderman '751 does not contemplate claim 90 elements 2 and 5 “presenting a client interface on a first computer configured for at least one providing user of a plurality of providing users to provide identifying information” and “storing said identifying information on a second computer where said identifying information is searchable by a plurality of searching users.” Shneiderman '751 describes a method that requires only one computer. Shneiderman '751 does not teach or suggest a method that employs “a first computer” and “a second computer.”

Shneiderman '751 does not contemplate, teach, or suggest annotating images by more than one user. For example, in Shneiderman, if user A tagged someone as “Dad” in a first image, and user B tagged a different person as “Dad” in a second image, both images would still be tagged as “Dad” even though they identify different “Dads.” See Figure 3. Thus, Shneiderman

does not contemplate, teach or suggest differentiating and uniquely identifying objects across images.

Shneiderman '751 does not comprise the limitations of Applicant's independent claim 90, and, as such, does not teach, suggest, or disclose Applicant's independent claim 90. Claims 106, 108, 109, and 110 are dependent upon claim 90, and are therefore respectfully novel over Shneiderman '751.

Shneiderman '751 respectfully likewise does not anticipate independent claims 98, 103, and 114 for the same reasons listed above with respect to Applicant's claim 90. Claims 107, 111, 112, and 113 are dependent upon claim 98, and are therefore respectfully novel over Shneiderman '751.

Provisional Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner provisionally rejected claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Shneiderman '751 in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,878 B1 ("Eintracht '878"). Eintracht appears to describe a system directed to the synchronization of notes between users in a collaborative environment, where one user annotates a document, and these updated annotations are shared among all users with their own copy of the document.

As amended, Shneiderman '751 in view of Eintracht '878 respectfully do not contemplate claim 90, element 3 "presenting a second client interface on said first computer configured for said at least one providing user of said plurality of providing users to create at least one contact relationship between said plurality of providing users." Emphasis added. Instead, Eintracht '878 describes a system for annotating collaborative documents stored on a web server. Col. 6, ll. 32 – 35. As such, Shneiderman '751 in view of Eintracht '878 do not teach, suggest, or disclose a method for creating "at least one contact relationship between said plurality of providing users."

Likewise Shneiderman '751 in view of Eintracht '878 do not contemplate claim 90, element 4 as amended "obtaining said identifying information from said at least one providing user wherein said identifying information comprises information that uniquely identifies said at least one object in said image data and wherein said identifying information further comprises location information that identifies coordinates of said at least one object and wherein said identifying information further comprises data obtained from a list of said at least one contact relationship." Emphasis added. Instead, Eintracht '878 discloses a method where an annotation can be located in terms of the X, Y coordinates of the document. Col. 7, ll. 57 – 65. Shneiderman '751 in view of Eintracht '878 do not teach, suggest, or disclose a method where the "identifying information further comprises data obtained from a list of said at least one contact relationship."

Shneiderman '751 in view of Eintracht '878 respectfully likewise do not anticipate independent claims 98, 103, and 114 for the same reasons listed above with respect to Applicant's claim 90. Claims 107, 111, 112, and 113 are dependent upon claim 98, and are therefore respectfully novel over Shneiderman '751 in view of Eintracht '878.

To further prosecution, please note that Shneiderman '751 in view of Eintracht '878 do not anticipate new independent claim 115. For example, Shneiderman '751 in view of Eintracht '878 do not contemplate claim 115 element 1 or 2 "creating a contact relationship between website users" and "storing an association between said website users when said contact relationship exists." Shneiderman '751 in view of Eintracht '878 do not teach, suggest or disclose "creating a contact relationship between website users." Claims 116 and 117 are dependent upon claim 115, and are therefore respectfully novel over Shneiderman '751 in view of Eintracht '878.

Summary

Applicant respectfully submits that Shneiderman '751, neither alone nor in combination with Eintracht '878, teaches, suggests or discloses independent claim 90. Claims 106, 108, 109, and 110 are dependent upon claim 90, and are therefore allowable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons stated above.

Applicant further respectfully submits that Shneiderman '751, neither alone nor in combination with Eintracht '878, teaches, suggests nor discloses independent claim 98. Claims 107, 111, 112, and 113 are dependent upon claim 98, and are therefore allowable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons stated above.

Applicant further respectfully submits that Shneiderman '751, neither alone nor in combination with Eintracht '878, teaches, suggests or discloses independent claims 103 and 114.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons stated herein, Applicant respectfully submits the claims as presented herein are patentable over the cited prior art and are therefore in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance for the claims in this case. Should the Examiner believe otherwise Applicant requests a telephonic interview as per the attached telephonic interview request form.

Respectfully submitted,
Dalina Law Group, P.C.

/DN58017/

Daniel Nakaji, Reg. No. 58,017
P. (858) 442-5877
F. (858) 777-5425